



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

higher over the lower, of the whole over the partial, makes the essence of the good" (p. 44). It will also grieve those advanced thinkers who have outgrown the "organic concept" to find that it is the constant vehicle of Professor Schmoller's thought. "The study of social organs and institutions has the same relation to knowledge of the social body that the study of anatomy has to knowledge of the physical body" (p. 64). The interdependence of legal, cultural, ethical, and economic phases of the social process, as the reality out of which the economic abstraction is derived, is also taken for granted so constantly that the doctrine of this author seems to have a vitality usually wanting in economic treatises. He seems to be analyzing the actual world, not merely a series of processes dissected out of the real world.

The most virile economic thinking in the United States for the last twenty years has probably been more generally affected by Wagner than by his colleague, Schmoller. Probably Professor Ely has done more than any single man to pass along the influence of the former. In turning the leaves of this book the surmise is suggested that President Hadley may have been more impressed by the latter. At all events there is much in Dr. Hadley's method and in his perspective that might well have been suggested by Schmoller.

Professor Schmoller is among the most human of German economists. The man is not submerged in the specialist. His writings, like his presence, convey the impression that his interest in "problems" is incidental to his interest in men. The present book is as vital as a lawyer's appeal for his client. One may open it almost at random, and the thought will be found to flow close to the stream of modern men's interests. Much of the material of the volume is already in the notebooks of many Americans. The elaborated and printed lectures will help to extend every dimension of our social conceptions.

A. W. S.

Political Parties in the United States from 1846 to 1861. By JESSE MACY, LL.D., Professor of Political Science in Iowa College. "The Citizen's Library." The Macmillan Co., 1900. Pp. viii + 333. \$1.25.

PROFESSOR MACY has the penetrating quality of wisdom which Americans have beatified in Abraham Lincoln. If he parleys with trifles it is to play with them as a relaxation from serious pursuits. When he is attending to business, nonessentials are brushed aside

with little ceremony and he proceeds at once to the heart of the matter. It would be difficult to name an American better qualified to tell the story of our politics to average Americans. There are men who could bring to bear profounder legal learning and more microscopic historical information. There are few, if any, who could bring the significant facts home to the intelligent but non-special reader more genially than Professor Macy.

This little book will be wholesome reading for the generations of us to whom the events of the middle quarters of the century are ancient history. I predict that it will win its way to a wide welcome. Its quality could hardly be better indicated than by quotation of the last paragraphs of the chapter "Abraham Lincoln as a Democrat" (pp. 255-7):

That which constituted the irrepressible conflict in 1858 was the fact that, by a large body of American citizens, a fundamental principle of democracy had been systematically violated for a whole generation. The people had professed to believe in democracy, yet in respect to one conspicuous institution they had pursued a policy of repression of public opinion. This was not true in the South alone: in the North as well immense pressure was brought to bear in the churches, in colleges and universities, and in commercial circles, against the frank and open discussion of the slavery question. By this restraint upon discussion, where discussion was much needed, a generation had been permitted to grow up victims of a fatal delusion. The North was allowed to fall into false beliefs about the South and about slavery; the South was likewise deluded into false beliefs about the North. Having violated the fundamental principles of free government, the political parties, as national organs for discussion and action, went to pieces, and nothing was left for the deluded people but to fight and to suffer until the state was destroyed or a mutual understanding was restored. The Civil War was a consequence of a neglect of political duty. The quiet, the orderly, the industrious, the thoughtful had permitted the growth of a despotic policy which for a generation had shackled free speech. When the slavery debate would not down at the bidding of the undemocratic South, they left the discussion to injudicious agitators in the North and "fire-eaters" in the South. Thus democracy failed in the New World, as every former attempt had failed, because power was allowed to drift into the hands of those who did not believe in democracy. Then, as was inevitable, freedom of discussion had been suppressed, and the people, deprived of the privilege of arguing out their differences, fell back into the old, despotic way of fighting them out.

When Mr. Lincoln asserted, in course of his great debate with Douglas in 1858, that the Democratic party, as led by the southern slavocracy, would be satisfied with nothing less than that the people of the country should "quit" saying that they believed slavery to be wrong, that they should "quit" thinking about it, that they should "quit" caring for it, he but called attention to a general condition of public sentiment in the North as well as in the South. The people had accepted the undemocratic dictum of certain aristocratic teachers, that there were certain subjects of public import upon which it was wrong to think and to talk freely. This is

another way of saying that the great body of the people did not believe in democracy. Though they had left themselves without any means of government except democracy, they had rejected democracy. They were trusting to accident, to tricks of constitutional barriers, to the facile recourse of running away from political responsibility and taking refuge in the wilderness. Lincoln, as a typical democrat, called his countrymen back to the elemental principles of free government. He made them see that upon every public question it was both their right and their duty to think, to be anxious, and so to express their convictions as to control the conduct of their government. He started American democracy upon a new and more hopeful career, because guided by more logical and consistent principles.

A. W. S.